

NEW CHRISTIAN

JULY-AUG. 1957

EDITED BY KENNETH LESLIE

SURPRISE ATTACK

By Louise Harding

SCIENTISTS AND SAINTS IN THE NUCLEAR CRISIS

WE SHALL NOT ESCAPE HISTORY

SCIENCE FOR PEACE

SAYINGS OF THOMAS TRAHERNE



Vol. XII, No. 10

30 cents

SURPRISE ATTACK

By Louise Harding

"The death of Lincoln was a disaster for Christendom. I fear that foreign bankers with their craftiness and tortuous tricks will entirely control the exuberant riches of America and use it to systematically corrupt modern civilization. They will not hesitate to plunge the whole of Christendom into war and chaos that the earth should become their intertance."—Bismarck on the death of Lincoln.

The Not-So-Amiable Ike.

Last fall, when Stevenson urged that the US give "serious consideration" to stopping H-bomb tests, President Eisenhower called the proposal a "theatrical gesture."

This year, *Dr. Linus Pauling*, Nobel Prize biochemist, said: "The bomb tests that have been made so far will ultimately have caused the deaths of about 1 million persons in the world. These 1 million persons will have died 10 or 20 or 30 years earlier than their life span because the radiation has produced bone cancer, leukemia or some other disease. It is indeed a crime against the human race. It is immoral, a violation of the principles of humanity."

On June 3, Dr. Pauling announced that two thousand American scientists had joined him in signing an appeal to stop testing nuclear bombs.

In a statement announcing the appeal, Dr. Pauling said: "No organization was involved in the formulation of the appeal or the collection of signatures."

On June 5, at a press conference, Eisenhower said (AP) what happens next in the world is up to the Russians (who for more than a year have been clamoring for a general stopping of the tests). He said the United States must and will continue to test nuclear weapons, partly to reduce their deadly radioactive fallout. He claimed the US had made large strides toward this goal. Howbeit, on May 27, Alvin C. Graves, a scientist at the Los Alamos atomic laboratory in New Mexico, said: "We have agreed that we cannot produce an absolutely clean (atomic) weapon. I think that is clear." He said the bulk of the radiation from Bombs already exploded *will be falling through the next ten years.*

Thomas E. Murray, "retiring" member of the Atomic Energy Commission whom President Eisenhower refused to re-appoint, last week punctured the Administration's atomic policy. He said that the fallout of multimegaton (million-ton) nuclear explosions was "uncontrollable" and that the facts showed no substance to the premise of AEC Chairman Lewis I. Strauss that he would soon produce a bomb that was big, "clean" and all but filter-tipped. (National Guardian, July 8, 1957).

What Did Eisenhower Mean by an "Organized Affair"?

He had said at the press conference "I noticed that (in) many instances scientists that seem to be out of their own field of competence are getting into this argument, and it looks like almost

an organized affair." He wanted the testimony of geneticists, he said.

On that same date, four geneticists, all members of the National Academy of Sciences, testified the tests should be stopped.

As to "fields of competence," Strauss has no competence at all as a scientist.

Eisenhower told the pressmen that it is better to endure some damage by tests, than risk total destruction by war. This is *nonsense*. The Russians would run equal "risk" by halting the tests. The worst that could happen—since it is impossible to make a large test without detection: the tremors are carried along the surface of the earth and the poisoning of the air is detected very soon—would be that US would be behind for *one test*, and the materials for that could be prepared ahead.

Reverting to the idea of a "clean" bomb: it is nonsensical if only this country exploded them. USA is busy, all over the world, setting up or maintaining dictatorships which, in due time, are not going to stop at bombs! The scientists who abetted Hitler took refuge in Franco Spain in considerable numbers. Such outfits are not going to observe gentlemen's agreements regarding Bombs, or Germs, or any other deviltry.

"Ike" had a jeer for the Columbia broadcasting system's presentation of Khrushchev. He referred to this as a commercial system, and implied that the Khrushchev interview was a commercial stunt. That it might have been intended to help avert war, did not seem to occur to Mr. Eisenhower.

Eisenhower said he hardly expected any more bombs as large as the one of March 1, 1954, would be exploded. However, on May 20, one of the most responsible radio operators said the Nevada tests were to include one more powerful than any previous blast.

We are told that some 14 bombs are to be set off during the Nevada tests, one to be exploded underground. The Garloch earth fault, in this vicinity, runs from west to east, into Nevada, connecting on the west with the San Andreas fault. If the Nevadans are sensible, they will say, as they did once before, NO on any tests made under the surface of the earth, among these unstable strata.

Who Has Supported Stopping the Tests?

In the October 1956 issue of *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, Dr. Ralph Lapp said: Explosions of 13 more "normal" hydrogen bombs or five super-bombs could contaminate the atmosphere with Strontium 90 beyond the danger of human life. He also said that the Atomic Energy Commission in its semi-annual report released last July grossly underestimated the danger of Strontium 90. This conflicted with a statement made by Eisenhower that "The continuance of the present rate of H-bomb testing—by the most sober and responsible scientific judgment—does not imperil the health of humanity."

In June 1956, the National Academy of Sciences warned that "any large increase" in hydrogen explosions would be "a matter of serious concern" to the very existence of the human race.

March 21, 1956, the eminent British atomic scientist, Prof. Frederick Soddy, said the H-bomb explosions are "getting out of hand."

Oct. 27, 1956, 22 Worcester and Shrewsbury scientists, including 18 at the world famous Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, Shrewsbury, declared the possible danger in hydrogen bombs is "a real problem which must be faced and should be discussed openly." They said that H-bomb fallout, "including Strontium 90, one of the deadliest isotopes which can cause cancer and blood disorders, is washed out of the atmosphere by rain and incorporated into grass and vegetables."

On Oct. 27, Dr. Hermann J. Muller, Indiana's Nobel Prize winning geneticist, said it is "incredibly reckless" to continue H-bomb tests.

On Oct. 28 seventy atomic scientists took issue with the Administration "white paper" which claimed only the biggest H-bomb tests could be detected. They stated that these explosions, in fact, can be detected and studied around the world.

Nov. 16, Drew Pearson reported that Senator Albert Gore, commenting on the H-bomb, had said: "I know what I'm talking about. I am a member of the Atomic Energy Committee that has all the secrets. I know more about it than the President because I have taken the time to study the facts and he hasn't. I can tell you that Strontium 90 can be and has been fatal. I can tell you **that many of the scientists of the United States are worried about the future of the American people if these tests continue.**"

President Eisenhower, Oct. 23, said that present H-bomb testing "does not imperil the health of humanity."

Dr. A. H. Sturtevant, one of the world's foremost geneticists, answering the question as to how harmful is radio-strontium, said "Extremely harmful The Radiation Hazards Committee of the Federation of American Scientists states, 'It may well be true that in certain areas of the world, the Strontium 90 hazard has already passed the danger point, to say nothing of the additional production of the material in further tests.'"

A Slight Mistake!

NY, Feb. 20, 1957. A National Bureau of Standards official said today a group of radiation experts has found that the maximum permissible dose of radiation to which a person can be exposed without serious likelihood of harm *is considerably lower than previously believed.*

Dr. Lauriston S. Taylor told a symposium sponsored by the Sloan-Kettering institute for Cancer Research and Hunter College that the National Committee on Radiation Protection has found that the maximum permissible dose *is one-third of the previous figure.*

Dr. James F. Crow, professor of genetics at the University of Wisconsin, told the symposium "there is no safe dose" of radiation.

"Each dose, however small, causes a risk of genetic harm proportional to the dose."

From Northeastern Union Farmer, March 1957.

One of the Nation's top scientists told the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently that atomic radiation from H-bomb testing would be the cause of physical defects in at least 6,000 babies to be born this year and that the rate of such births would increase proportionately as the radiation effects are passed on to future generations.

The scientist was Dr. Warren Weaver, former President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and one of the leading geneticists of the world. He appeared before the Committee as the representative of the Academy of Sciences.

Dr. Weaver testified January 16th and so far as is known not a single commercial newspaper in the country carried the story. It was covered and sent out by United Press which means that it got into the offices of all the leading papers of the country. The writer picked the story up from a local radio station.

He said his estimate of 6,000 defective babies was really an understatement "because the number of defective births attributed to radioactivity will be more in the second generation, still more in the third, and go on for 50 generations.

"British scientists estimated tonight that a hydrogen bomb exploded high in the stratosphere might eventually produce bone cancer in 1,000 persons for each explosive unit in the bomb equivalent to a million tons of TNT.

(Report by the Atomic Scientists' Association, quoted in NY Times, April 17, 1957).

Professor Says AEC Misleads on Fallout

New Haven, Conn, May 29, 1955. AP—A Yale physicist tonight charged the Atomic Energy Commission with giving misleading information about the danger to mankind from atomic test blasts.

Said Franklin Hutchinson, Assistant Professor of radiation physics, on a Yale radio program: If AEC officials have data to back up their contention that there are no harmful genetic effects from the radiation that's just wonderful. The trouble is, I don't know of any such data, and neither does anyone else to whom I've talked."

He warned that the radioactive fallout from such blasts are producing genetic effects in mankind that will be showing up for "thousands of years to come."

The San Francisco Chronicle carried a report made to the American Society of Mechanical Engineers on what would happen to San Francisco if a bomb were dropped several miles out at sea.

It would be something of a problem, so it seems. Deadly

radio-active fallout would cover every building and every square inch in the city and for many miles around it.

But Myron B. Hawkins, head of the technological developments branch of the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory here in our midst, says they are prepared to tackle the job. "Never say die" is Hawkins' motto, evidently. All that is needed is to put a crew of 11,000 men to work for 30 days. (In "No Place to Hide," it was told how contaminated ships could not be cleaned: one of them was brought back here and finally sunk.)

But after everything has been scraped down to the proper depth, at the end of 30 days, people could emerge from shelters—or return to the city from evacuation centers—safely.

Until everything had been decontaminated, "everyone would remain in safe shelters—which thus far have not been built."

Who's crazy now?

What the citizens would eat and drink for 30 days is not explained in this reassuring (fairy) tale or bedtime yarn, designed to prevent any uneasiness at this moment—to say nothing of panic.

Who Wants the Tests Continued, and Why?

AEC, an appointed body, has proved itself (with some exceptions) willing to accede to the wishes of the U.S. militarists, both in minimizing the dangers of the tests and in keeping the public in ignorance regardless of the dangers incurred by such ignorance.

A few men have come out openly, in favour of continuing the tests. The names of some of them, and the reasons furnished, are as follows:—

Dr. C. W. Schilling, deputy director, Div. Biology and Medicine, AEC. "We must gamble," said Schilling, "with the probability of radiation damage to a few individuals in order to secure the survival of the total society."

Dr. R. S. Pitzer, dean of the Univ. of California's college of chemistry, and former director of research for AEC, termed the appeal of Dr. Pauling and his supporters, "an unfortunate action" that may increase the risk of future war.

Dr. Joel H. Hildebrand, emeritus professor of chemistry, declared that there can be no true measure of the danger involved without quantitative comparisons of radio-action fallout with natural radiation and current X-ray usage. He chided Pauling: "Scientists should be sure of their ground before claiming scientific authority for alarmist assertions."

University men, these days, are often not very sure of jobs and promotion if they fly in the face of the known wishes of the powerful faction in USA that intends war and means to use atomic weapons to offset its minority in men.

March 10, 1956, Chicago Sun-Times carried an interview with atomic scientist Harold C. Urey, Nobel prizewinner.

Goaded by questions of a challenging audience . . . Urey de-

clared . . . that "I worked on the atomic bomb, but I didn't like it . . . If I hadn't, I would have been ostracized from society. And the people who ostracized me would have been a large element of society.

"I would have been treated like the coward at the front (in battle)."

Speaking with some emotion, the grey-haired University of Chicago professor went on:

"I have a little niche in life in which I am forced to move. We all do. So do you. We are not free agents.

"The scientists who developed these weapons are among the ones who fear them most. We tried hard long ago to tell the people about the dangers."

Such was not the attitude of the eighteen leading German scientists who lately faced Adenauer and flatly refused to do atomic-weapon work.

Professor Einstein left his "niche in life" and came to USA because he would not develop the bomb for Hitler. It was only because he believed Hitler would get the Bomb first, that he helped develop it for what, at any rate, he believed to be a struggle for liberty.

Your reporter is reminded that just before the 18 German scientists who refused to make or handle atomic weapons met Adenauer in Bonn, Werner Heisenberg, top atomic scientist and Nobel Prize winner, said in a press interview, "Of course, individuals can be given protection. If someone has an underground atom-bomb-proof shelter, equipped with oxygen apparatus and containing reserves of food and water, he can perhaps survive for days or weeks until the worst radioactive contamination has passed.

"It is, however, unthinkable that the majority of the population could be given adequate protection. We cannot build our towns underground and we cannot evacuate millions of people to the country within a quarter of an hour."

In getting to a comparatively safe refuge, a helicopter would be a great convenience, assuredly. No family should be without one.

Who Wants War?

—From "The Last Illusion", by Hershel D. Meyer, pgs. 372-3.

On Aug. 26, 1950 . . . Francis P. Matthews, Truman's Secretary of the Navy, stated: "To achieve peace, we should be willing to pay the price of instituting a war . . . We should become the first aggressors for peace." James Reston commented: "The speech by Mr. Matthews, a man always open to suggestion from his superiors, was clearly a trial balloon. The method of launching it was a favourite one of Mr. Matthew's political boss, Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, who has been selling the same doctrine of the preventive war in private conversations around Washington (NY Times, Sept. 1, 1950.) (Matthews adheres to the Vatican State. Louis Johnson, attorney for the China Lobby, accompanied

Dulles to the Middle East and Korea, *just before war broke out in Korea.*)

MacArthur before the Joint Cong. Com., on how to insure that war should not exist:—His advice was to follow the example of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. "Take the moral leadership of the world and *try something like it . . . The first blow may well be the decisive one.* (May 5, 1951).

"America Over Britain," Philip Bolsover. p.10.

" . . . as long ago as Oct. 27, 1951, the magazine Paris-Match published an interview with General Eisenhower in which the future U.S. President partly revealed the American military plan of campaign in a war against the Soviet Union. The Northern European Command, he said, would conduct operations near Leningrad, the Southern European Command in Austria or HUNGARY, while the armed forces of the Middle East, *which the Americans expect to use*, would fight in the southern part of the USSR.

—Not much "defense" there!—That was also the plan of Hitler's armies.

(Bolsover, con.)

On Jan. 22, 1952 a writer in the *Wall Street Journal* said the Government's arms program meant, in the view of military men, that "by 1957 or 1958, the U.S. will be able to fight an atomic war." America would then have enough bombers for bombing all Russia's centers "according to military planners." Theoretically, there would be "enough bombers to wipe out all of Russia's major industrial cities."

June 12, 1957, Norstad, commander of North Atlantic Treaty forces, said NATO is capable of "destroying anything that is of military significance in Russia at the present time. I believe this is a capability we can continue to have five years from now and ten years from now." Testifying before Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on the foreign aid bill . . . Norstad said the West can strike at the Soviet Union from 250 U.S. air bases and 150 NATO air fields . . . But in any case, he, said, Western striking power is so great and so dispersed as to pose "a military problem to the Russians that is very serious and very difficult to solve."
(Wall Street Journal, con.)

They (the U.S.) would also have atomic shells and radioactive dust to spray over cities . . . "*The new atom program is designed for war—not peace.* But it will have benefits for civilians and business too. The big expansion program will be contracted out to private firms."

(Russia cannot be expected to be enthusiastic about "Ike's" open-skies program after this. The industrial centers of US are concentrated, and known to all. Russia's are scattered, and more or less hidden. The Yankee bargain would be a sorry one for Russia . . . LH)

(Bolsover, p.83) “. . . large sections of American trade unionism lack any philosophy but that of the employer . . . Sometimes this philosophy is expressed in a single sentence, as when Mr. James Carey said at a conference against Communism held in the Hotel Astor, NY:

“In another war we will join with the fascists to defeat Communism.”

Sometimes big business puts the situation in a more general way, as in the magazine *Fortune* in Oct. 1951: “In the deepest sense, the present day trade union movement has accepted capitalist society.”

The radio speaker for AFL-CIO is wont to declare, in unctuous tones, “What is good for the United States is good for AFL-CIO.”

Jan. 22, 1952, Dulles, speaking as the direct, official representative of the President of the United States, said U.S. must take positive steps for the downfall of the present government of China.

(Quoted by Herbert Morrison, in the British Parliament).

Jan. 18, 1951, speaking at March Air Base, Emmett O'Donnell said:

“I think we'd be very effective with the ultimate weapon against Red China.” Asked by a reporter to define that weapon, he said: *“The atomic bomb. They'll understand the last when it's put to them!”*

Are the Warmongers Completely Mad?

No, they are not. They realize the powerful capacities of Russia to inflict atomic damage of the most terrible character on the United States. The only way an atomic war started by them could accomplish its aim—and they are always talking of how they will *win the next war*—would be by making a SURPRISE ATTACK. That is precisely what they contemplate, although to the last moment they would utter hypocritical talk of “Peace” and “Defense.”

Remember that, on Nov. 15, 1954, Senator William Knowland told the US Senate: “Coexistence and atomic stalemate will result in ultimate Communist victory . . . Time is running out, and I would remind the Senate that in this day and age of the airplane and the atomic weapon, time is not necessarily on the side of the free world.”

It is not, however, the plane and Bomb that are deciding the battle between Monopoly Capitalism and Socialism today. The people of India are stricken with a plague of cholera, due to miserable sanitation. They look across the border and see that China is free of cholera, which used to devastate that land. The Chinese dress simply, but decently and comfortably. They eat plain food, but no longer fall from starvation on the public street. India can see all this for herself—and one of the southern provinces went Communist at the last election.

In Italy, USA has poured in millions, but Zellerbach objected to a fair and comprehensive system of land distribution, saying

that large farms were more efficient. So now, the people of Italy have profited not at all by the money paid to bribe a reactionary crowd into power at one of those "free" elections we hear so much about.

Look at Iran! Look anywhere around the world. Where can you find that U.S. domination has worked in behalf of true democracy? Nowhere, of course. The fascists of America have joined hands with fascists abroad. They have set up centers of infection which presently are not going to stop with Bombs—which, after all, cost a good deal of money. Why resort to them when Poison Gas and deadly Germs can be manufactured at such bargain cost? Does anybody think Franco would have conscientious scruples against using Poison Gas and worse?

U.S. Reaction has sowed the wind, and the devil and the *whirlwind* are already to pay!

SCIENTISTS AND SAINTS IN THE NUCLEAR CRISIS

We have devoted most of our space in this issue to Louise Harding who has been hammering forcefully and eloquently at the folly and wickedness of nuclear warfare ever since Nagasaki and who in this series of comments sounds the alarm of approaching crisis. She warns of an intended surprise attack to be engineered by the US war party which means effectively today the US government. The arguments are many and powerful for such an intention. According to Dr. Walter Gerlach, the German scientist, "In the atomic era we cannot use the old method of threatening with war and then making war." In other words the attack will precede the declaration, which will undoubtedly include the excuse that *they* were on the point of attacking us and that we had to get the jump on them.

Science Re-orients Itself

Science, which is reason-in-action, when it is allowed to be itself, serves international, humane, co-operative, peace-loving purposes. As an example of science as it can be and will one day be, we have the International Geophysical Year in which scientists from the great antagonists, USA and USSR, meet in the friendly pursuit of truth.

Another example, a challenge rather than an accomplished fact, is the call of the German nuclear scientist, Otto Hahn, for a world-wide strike by scientists against further work on the nuclear arsenal of mass destruction.

In these cases, scientists are complete men, although in our view a scientist whose science subserves his humanity is more than just a scientist. Even this world-strike called for by Otto Hahn has become known at his "conscience crusade." One of Hahn's

devoted lieutenants is Dr. Walter Gerlach, referred to above, who is telling the Germans what sounds to most of the ordinary people of the world as the truth, that civil defense against nuclear weapons is impossible.

"If we do not exclude violence from our political thinking," says Gerlach, "international developments will lead to the use of the last and most powerful means . . ."

Gerlach knows something about radioactivity and has just published his findings. He begins with a categorical condemnation of nuclear weapon tests as "scientific nonsense." "Contrary to biased press reports," he asserts, "such tests are of no scientific value and do not present means of scientific research." The Munich nuclear physicist summarizes thus: "Radioactive matter, consisting in part of substances which will retain their activity for years, is absorbed by the human organism through rain or dust, either directly or indirectly.

"The pollution of our atmosphere increases, and, according to reliable estimates, only one-tenth of the long-living components of the bomb-dust so far has been deposited.

"Certainly the most serious dangers of radiation are those of mutation . . . The susceptibility of man to the danger of mutation is greater than that of animals experimented on."

Now, it matters not to us, nor should it matter to anyone, whether we include the scientist in the humanist or the humanist in the scientist. If we do the latter, then we may write of science what Paul wrote of love, saying, science seeketh not her own, is not puffed up, rejoiceth in the truth, envieth not, suffereth long and is kind. In the true gospel sense of the word we may call it unworldly, for science, as Professor Hahn practises it, will sacrifice respectability to truth, echoing the true Christian's devotion who is willing to become an outcast if it serve God's purpose. This may sound ridiculous to our modern ears, but right here is the meeting ground of science and religion. For a true scientist is as completely selfless, as devoted as any saint. Who is the saint of our times? Is it not Einstein? I am not speaking of his formula for ordering facts, his theory of relativity. I speak of his spirit, truth-serving, self-emptying. For Einstein put truth before respectability. "When the issue is one of Truth and Justice," he said in the last statement he made while he was still with us, "there can be no differentiation between small problems and great ones." With these words he exposed the hypocrisy of those who would continue the nuclear tests even if they do cost a few thousand lives. Where is the Christian church today with its pretended concern for the individual? Has Christ gone out of his church and has he gone into the laboratory in search of truth-seekers?

"WE CANNOT ESCAPE HISTORY"

"Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted seeds of depotism around your own doors. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage, and you are preparing your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of those around you, you have lost the genius of your own independence, and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises . . ."—Abe Lincoln.

"We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."—Abe Lincoln

"We cannot escape history."—Abe Lincoln.

What would he think today of the grotesque parody of these words as hawked about by that strange assortment of tycoons and their hangers-on who have been appointed leaders and guides of our people by the corporative power he feared. They rant of an American Century. In the name of the free world for which Lincoln fought and died, they would lay the world under tribute for their own aggrandizement and profit. What he nobly saved they are doing their best to meanly lose. The power whose tables he overthrew mocks his memory as we all mock Christ's memory with our pious platitudes, our hands still crimson with his blood, having crucified him a million-fold in the rice-fields of Korea.

We shall not escape history!

SCIENTISTS FOR PEACE

It would appear that few American newspapers were interested in the findings of the international committee of top scientists who met this summer at the home of Cyrus Eaton in Pugwash, Nova Scotia. There was a brief reference to the meeting in the Chicago *Sun-Times*. We are proud of Cyrus Eaton and salute him as a world statesman who has shown by his generosity to the Soviet Union and by arranging this get-together across the Cold War barriers that he possesses a clear insight into the dread realities of the present arms race.

Among the scientists taking part were Bertrand Russell (absent in person on account of illness), three Soviet scientists, three Japanese, a Chinese, a Pole, an Austrian, a Frenchman, five British Commonwealth and six Americans. Present also was the abiding influence of Einstein.

The chief points covered by their findings may be summed up thus:

WAR MUST BE ELIMINATED

It cannot be disputed that a full-scale nuclear war would be an utter catastrophe. Its effects would be thousands of times greater than the fallout effects from nuclear tests. In the combatant countries, hundreds of millions of people would be killed outright, by the blast and heat, and by the ionizing radiation produced at the instant of explosion. If so-called "dirty" bombs were used, areas would be made uninhabitable for extended periods of time, and additional hundreds of millions of people would probably die from delayed effects of local fallout radiations, some in the exposed population from direct radiation injury and some in succeeding generations as a result of genetic effects. Even countries not directly hit by bombs would suffer through global fallout, which under certain conditions might be of such intensity as to cause largescale genetic and other injury.

War must be eliminated, and this calls for:

The lessening of tensions.

The ending of the arms race.

The prompt suspension of nuclear bomb tests.

Scientists of all countries without regard to political and economic systems can dedicate themselves to peace because they share common beliefs:

With the penetration of science into the world of atomic nuclei, humanity has entered a new epoch.

The developments of science and technology have paramount importance for the future of all mankind. This imposes upon scientists the obligation to be more actively concerned with matters of public policy, and upon political leaders the duty to take fully into account the scientific and technological facts.

In the past, nations have often resorted to force in the quest for natural resources and fruits of labor. These methods must now be replaced by a common effort to create wealth for all.

The security of mankind demands that no section of it shall have the capacity to destroy any other.

The need of all parts of mankind to cooperate in the growth of the total sum of human knowledge and wealth, despite ideological and other differences which may divide them, is permanent and not a matter of temporary "coexistence" of different political or economic systems.

Tradition tends to place the emphasis in the education of youth on separate ideals of single nations, including the glorification of wars. The atomic age urgently requires a modification of these traditions. Without abandoning loyalty to national heritage or fundamental principles of the different societies, education must emphasize the fundamental and permanent community of the interests of mankind in peace and cooperation, irrespective of national boundaries and differences in economic or political systems.

Science develops most effectively when it is free from interference by any dogma imposed from outside, and permitted to question all postulates, including her own. Without this freedom of scientific thought, and the freedom to exchange information and ideas, full utilization of the constructive possibilities of science will not be achieved.

SAYINGS OF THOMAS TRAHERNE

"There is a certain kind of sympathy which runs through the universe by which all men are fed in the feeding of one."

"The same wisdom which created the world is the only light in which it is enjoyed."

"Let thy superfluities give place to other men's conveniences, thy conveniences to their necessities, thy necessities to their extremities."

"The soul is shrivelled up and buried in a grave, that does not love."

"God is present by love alone."

"No man can sin that seeth clearly the beauty of God's face."

"You never enjoy the world aright till the sea itself floweth in your veins, till you are clothed with the heavens and crowned with the stars."



We have been greatly encouraged by many letters recently received with renewals of subscriptions and generous expressions of faith in our venture. In different ways we have been made aware during the past year of a growing re-orientation of the whole world democratic movement towards the poetic heart of religion. In an early issue we hope to comment on some of the possibilities of this new outlook.

Perhaps the time may soon be ripe for a fresh attempt to enlarge our readership.

NEW CHRISTIAN

JULY - AUG. 1957

EDITED BY KENNETH LESLIE

EDITOR

Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Rev. John Tunncliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezser
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson

Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer Kennard
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

NEW CHRISTIAN is published monthly by New Christian Books, Elmsdale, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues \$3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No Agents.**